



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,196	08/15/2000	Arto Palin	4208-4353	1563
27123	7590	08/28/2007		
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101			EXAMINER NGUYEN, HAU H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/639,196

Applicant(s)

PALIN, ARTO

Examiner

Hau H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The response filed on June 22, 2007 has been fully considered in preparing for this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 43-44, 46-47, 49-52, 54-58, 60-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baskin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,307,055).

As per claim 43, as shown in Figs. 1-3, 8A, and 8B, Baskin et al. teach a mobile terminal 11 comprising:

- a processor 14;
- a memory 15 coupled to the processor for storing data provided by the processor;
- a display 18 coupled to the processor for displaying images provided by the processor;
- a splitting application configured to split received data into at least two parts for displaying at least two substantially different images (col. 6, lines 14-22, and lines 52-61).

Baskin et al. also teach a transmitter coupled to the processor configured to transmit at least one of the at least two parts to an external display device (see Fig. 2).

Although Baskin et al. do not explicitly teach the transmitter is a short range transmitter, (Baskin does teach the interface 50, Fig. 2, can be a wireless interface as shown on col. 6, lines

Art Unit: 2628

37-44), it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the interface at nodes D-F (Fig. 3) to be a short range transmitter in order to transmit data locally and wirelessly.

As per claim 44, as cited above, Baskin et al. teach a receiver for receiving a signal (adapter 13).

As per claim 46, Baskin et al. further teach the memory comprising a buffer to buffer the received signal to provide time for the splitting application to split the received data into at least two parts (Figs. 6A-E, and Fig. 8A, and col. 6, lines 58-61).

As per claim 47, Baskin et al. further teach forwarding to the display the at least one part of the received data that is not transmitted to the external display device (i.e. to the auxiliary monitor 18).

Claims 49, 54, and 57, which are similar in scope to claim 43, are thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 50, 55, and 58, which are similar in scope to claim 44, are thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 51, 56, and 60, which are similar in scope to claim 46, are thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 52 and 61, which are similar in scope to claim 47, are thus rejected under the same rationale.

4. Claims 45, 48, 53, 59, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baskin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,307,055) in view of Harrison et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,420).

As per claim 45, as cited above, Baskin et al. teach all the limitations of claim 45, except that the receiver is a wide-area network receiver. However, Harrison et al. teach a method of splitting received data, which comprises a primary data and associated data, and providing the separated data to the targeted display devices (Figs. 4 and 6, and their disclosure). Harrison et al. further teach the receiver 74 is also a wide-area network receiver (col. 8, line 62 to col. 9, line 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize the method as taught by Harrison et al. in combination with the method as taught by Baskin et al. so that more display devices can communicate with one another.

As per claim 48, Baskin et al. fails to teach the splitting application is configured to split received data into at least two parts based on headers (recipient identifications) in the received data. However, this is what Harrison et al. teach (Figs. 12 and 13, col. 12, lines 14-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize this method of Harrison et al. in combination with the method as taught by Baskin et al. in order to provide the received data to the appropriate target recipient device.

Claim 59, which is similar in scope to claim 45, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 53 and 62, which are similar in scope to claim 48, are thus rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed June 22, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to Applicant's arguments that the cited reference fails to teach "a splitting application configured to split received data into at least two parts for display tow substantially different images," the examiner disagrees. It should be noted that the cited portion

from the reference does not mean that the “analog switch 16” is the splitting application. In fact, it is referred to as how the image for both the main monitor and the auxiliary monitor is received at the handheld display device and split out to the two displays, where the parts of the split-out image are substantially different. To facilitate understanding the support of the rejection, the examiner refers to Fig. 8a of Baskin, wherein the combined main display memory and auxiliary display memory 97 receives the combined image for both the main monitor and the auxiliary monitor (col. 5, lines 6-22), and then split out at the combined display memory 97 as shown in Fig. 8a (see also col. 9, lines 45-52). Therefore, for at least the above reasons, the cited reference Baskin meets the minimum requirements of the claimed features, and therefore, rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2628

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hau H. Nguyen whose telephone number is: 571-272-7787. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI from 8:30-5:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on (571) 272-7794.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

H. Nguyen

8/23/2007



KEE M. TUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER